



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,051	01/16/2001	Alan R. Cohn	LIU1116895	7685

26389 7590 03/27/2003

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC  
1420 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

REDMAN, JERRY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3634

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/765,051

Applicant(s)

COHN ET AL

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-29, 31-42, 44-52, 54 and 56-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8, 15, 30, 43, 53 and 55 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

It is noted that the applicant has elected group 1-Figures 1-7 without traverse, which is directed to the subcombination of just the drive assembly. Therefore, the preamble of the independent claims does not carry any patentable weight; specifically, the recitation of the wheelchair lift and platform have not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951). The restriction is therefore FINAL.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 12, line 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis for "the drive assembly".

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 18-29, 31-42, 44-52, 54, and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweili in view of Springer et al. Sweili discloses an automatic reciprocating system comprising a plug assembly (24) operable to actuate the sliding door (5 and/or 7) between a plugged and unplugged position, link arms (88 and 90) rotating the door(s), and a drive assembly (21) for driving the doors to

an open positioned. Sweili fails to specifically disclose a latch assembly and a sensor assembly. Springer et al. disclose a drive assembly for reciprocating doors comprising a latching member (28), and a control system (74) having a plurality of sensors (56, 58, 60, and 119) for sensing the position in which the door is in and whether the door is locked or unlocked. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Sweili with a latch and sensors as taught by Springer et al. since a latch provides the door(s) to be locked into a position where it cannot move thereby preventing injuries to people leaving the vehicle. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Sweili with a control system utilizing sensors as taught by Springer et al. since sensors and a control system allows one to monitor the position of the door and whether the door is in a locked position.

Claims 2, 13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Springer et al. in view of Sweili. Springer et al. disclose an automatic reciprocating system comprising a cable drive system (Figure 22) for driving doors (20 and 110) between an opened and closed locked position. Springer et al. fail to disclose the doors to be of a plug type assembly. Sweili discloses a drive assembly for plug type doors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Springer et al. with a plug type door assembly as taught by Sweili since the plug type door assembly allows the doors to fit perfectly within an opening thus providing a smooth outer surface along the vehicle when the doors are in a closed and locked position.

Claims 6, 8, 15, 30, 43, 53, and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents to Reddy ('668 and 867), and Heffner et al. disclose elements similar to that of the applicant's invention.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 703-308-2120.

  
**Jerry Redman**  
Primary Examiner